# Memorandum

**To:** Chairman and Commissioners **Date:** October 17, 2003

From: Diane C. Eidam

BOOK ITEM 4.2
INFORMATION

Ref: Policy on AB 3090 Cash Reimbursements and GARVEE Debt Service

### <u>Issue</u>:

What limitations, if any, should the Commission place on its commitments for GARVEE bond debt service? Should the Commission extend its current policy limits on AB 3090 cash reimbursements to include GARVEE debt service, or should it place other limits on GARVEE debt service? When this issue was raised at the September meeting as part of a report on the current status of STIP cash commitments, the Commission asked staff to prepare a policy recommendation.

## **Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Commission consider the policy proposal in this book item as a baseline for discussion and possible action in December. This will allow time to receive comment from interested parties and allow time to receive and develop further information, including the year-by-year capacity in the 2004 STIP fund estimate. Also in December, the Commission is scheduled to consider action on five proposed STIP amendments that would make new cash commitments for AB 3090 reimbursements or GARVEE bond debt service.

### **Background:**

The Commission established its AB 3090 policy earlier this year when the freeze on allocations created a sudden demand for AB 3090 arrangements as a means of moving projects forward. Under an AB 3090 arrangement, a local agency uses its own funds to implement a STIP project and is programmed in a later year to receive either an undesignated replacement project or a direct cash reimbursement. The policy adopted in April generally gives preference to replacement projects and places limitations on cash reimbursements. Scheduled cash reimbursements are limited to \$200 million annually statewide and to \$50 million annually for the projects of any single agency or county. In addition, the policy limited the approval of cash reimbursements to projects that were programmed for delivery in the current fiscal year and to projects from future years that met each of three conditions: (1) the regional agency found the project to be its highest priority for the year of reimbursement, (2) the project qualified for Federal funding, and (3) the source of local funds to be used could not or would not be made available for an AB 3090 replacement project.

The primary reason for applying these policy limitations was that, by statute, a scheduled cash reimbursement has first priority statewide for a STIP allocation in the year in which it is programmed. The approval of an AB 3090 cash reimbursement locks in the highest priority for one project and makes future programming elsewhere less flexible. While other projects (including AB 3090 replacement projects) may be rescheduled to later years in the 2004 STIP, approved AB 3090 cash reimbursements may not be.

The current freeze on STIP allocations has also increased interest in Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bonding as a means of alternative financing. Under Federal and State law, the State may sell GARVEE bonds to cover the Federal portion of a STIP project's cost, with the debt service to be paid from future Federal apportionments that would otherwise be available for the STIP. The debt service payments are then counted against STIP county shares over an extended period, usually 10 to 12 years.

GARVEE debt service payments, like AB 3090 reimbursements, are STIP cash commitments. They have higher priority than any other STIP or SHOPP allocation, a priority even higher than AB 3090 reimbursements. This priority means that a GARVEE approval in one county can reduce programming flexibility in other counties, particularly when the debt service requires cash when there is a shortage of cash to support all projects as programmed.

### **Discussion:**

Since the September meeting, Commission and Department staff have been engaged in discussions with the State's bond counsel and bond underwriter for the GARVEE program. The bond underwriter has extensive experience with the GARVEE program and its use in other states. Those discussions have suggested the desirability of having a Commission policy to regulate GARVEE indebtedness in order to balance leveraging with the potential to achieve high investment grade ratings. The existence of such a policy would provide assurance of a higher level of coverage for bond debt service than is assured by statute alone. (The statutes limit annual repayment obligations to 30% of annual Federal revenues.) A higher level of coverage means reduced risk and a higher bond rating, which in turn reduces interest on the bond debt.

Our discussions with the bond underwriter suggest that annual GARVEE debt service ought to be limited to about \$350-400 million in order to achieve high investment-grade ratings. It is important to note that this is a cumulative limit. That is, if the Commission were to establish an annual debt service of \$350 million and then approve GARVEE bonds requiring the full \$350 million per year for debt service, there would be no capacity remaining to approve additional bonding until the first bonds were retired, probably not for 10 to 12 years. To use the full capacity at once would be to assume that no better projects or greater needs will be found later. For this reason, the Commission will probably want to establish lower interim limits for staged GARVEE approvals, retaining some capacity for later bonding.

Our discussions also suggest the desirability of maintaining a minimum GARVEE project size. Large projects reduce administrative costs, and the bond market will look more favorably upon an issue with projects of high impact or "essentiality." Project size is a major element, even if not the sole measure, of this impact. A desirable threshold for this purpose would be about \$50 million. At the same time, the Commission must recognize the mandate from the Legislature that the Commission's guidelines for the GARVEE program "be designed to allow as many counties as possible to establish eligibility for funding ... regardless of the population or geographic location of the county." One way to do this would be to consider smaller projects from smaller counties, provided that the projects are large in relation to the STIP county share.

### **Status of Current Commitments and Proposals:**

Attached to this item for reference is a listing of current and proposed commitments for AB 3090 cash reimbursements and GARVEE debt service. It includes the five STIP amendments being presented for notice in October.

### **Baseline Proposal:**

As a baseline, staff recommends the following set of policies. Even if individual figures in the recommendation are altered, this is meant to outline a comprehensive approach to the issue.

- Retain the present limitation on AB 3090 cash reimbursements, \$200 million annually statewide and \$50 million annually for any single county or agency, and review that limitation after the 2004 STIP is adopted.
- Limit GARVEE bonding to projects requiring bond proceeds either over \$50 million or over 80% of the county share for the 4-year period from FY 2004-05 through FY 2007-08.
- Adopt a long term policy limiting annual GARVEE debt service statewide to 15% of qualifying Federal revenues, which is about \$350 million annually. In addition, approve the following interim targets:
  - o Prior to the adoption of the 2004 STIP, limit the total of GARVEE debt service and AB 3090 cash reimbursements to \$250 million annually statewide and \$62.5 million annually for any single county or local agency. This 25% increase from the current AB 3090-only limits recognizes the Commission's prior commitments.
  - o In the adoption of the 2004 STIP, limit GARVEE debt service to \$160 million annually statewide and \$40 million annually for any single county or local agency.
  - o In the adoption of the 2006 STIP, limit GARVEE debt service to \$240 million annually statewide and \$60 million annually for any single county or local agency.

## STIP CASH COMMITMENTS, AB 3090 AND GARVEE DEBT SERVICE

(\$1,000's)

					Project Totals by Fiscal Year						
County	Agency	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	
			ed in Prior Programming								
Alameda	Caltrans 16R AB 3090 reimbursement (880 HOV)(02S-74A)		11,800	0	11,800	0	0				
Los Angeles	LACMTA		AB 3090 reimbursement (0S-52)(Eastside)	175,000	0	0	43,600	43,800	43,800	43,800	
Los Angeles	LACMTA		AB 3090 reimbursement (02S-63)(FY 03 PPM)	3,837	0	3,837	0	0	0	0	
Riverside	Caltrans		AB 3090 reimbursement (Rt 60/91/215)(02S-102)(RIP, 85%)	26,625	0	0	0	26,625	0	0	
Riverside	Caltrans		AB 3090 reimbursement (Rt 60/91/215)(02S-102)(IIP, 15%)	4,699	0	0	0	4,699	0	0	
Sacramento	Sacramento	9L02A	AB 3090 reimbursement (02S-89)(N 3rd, Vine, recon)	1,891	0	1,891	0	0	0	0	
			SUBTOTAL:	223,852	0	17,528	43,600	75,124	43,800	43,800	
GARVEE Debt	Service, Prior Allo	ocation A	Approvals								
Riverside	Caltrans		GARVEE debt (Rt 215, El Cerrito- Rt 60/91)(RIP, 85%)	109,403	0	14,986	17,025	25,805	25,798	25,789	
Riverside	Caltrans		GARVEE debt (Rt 215, El Cerrito- Rt 60/91)(IIP, 15%)	19,305	0	2,644	3,004	4,554	4,552	4,551	
San Diego	Caltrans		GARVEE debt (Rt 15, mid seg)(RIP 75%)(02S-51)	85,400	0	17,080	17,080	17,080	17,080	17,080	
San Diego	Caltrans		GARVEE debt (Rt 15, mid seg)(IIP 25%)(02S-51)	28,465	0	5,693	5,693	5,693	5,693	5,693	
Santa Clara	SCVTA		GARVEE debt (Rt 880 Coleman)(02S-60)	39,210	0	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842	
			SUBTOTAL:	281,783	0	48,245	50,644	60,974	60,965	60,955	
GARVEE Debt	Service, Other Pro	ogramm	ing Approved								
Santa Clara	SCVTA	443N	GARVEE debt (Rt 87 HOV North, Julian-Rt 280)(02S-60)	20,720	720	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	
Santa Clara	SCVTA	443S	GARVEE debt (Rt 87 HOV, Rt 280-Rt 85)(02S-60)	24,328	828	4,700	4,700	4,700	4,700	4,700	
			SUBTOTAL:	45,048	1,548	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	
			SOBIOTAL.	45,046	1,540	0,700	0,700	0,700	0,700	0,700	
AB 3090 Cash	Reimbursements,	Octobe	STIP Amendment Notices (December action)								
Los Angeles	Los Angeles		AB 3090 reimbursement (Tampa Av bridge)(02S-104)	243			243				
Los Angeles	Los Angeles		AB 3090 reimbursement (Winnetka Av bridge)(02S-104)	223			223				
Los Angeles	Los Angeles		AB 3090 reimbursement (Vanowen St bridge)(02S-104)	339			339				
Los Angeles	Los Angeles		AB 3090 reimbursement Laurel Canyon Bl bridge)(02S-104)	270			49	221			
Los Angeles	Los Angeles		AB 3090 reimbursement (Soto St bridge)(02S-104)	1,341			1,341				
Placer	Rocklin		AB 3090 reimbursement (Sierra Bl, Rt 80)(02S-115)(RIP)	7,432				7,432			
Placer	Rocklin		AB 3090 reimbursement (Sierra Bl, Rt 80)(02S-115)(IIP)	11,000				11,000			
San Diego	S D MTDB		AB 3090 reimbursement (auto fare tech)(02S-112)	19,500				19,500			
Tulare	Tulare County		AB 3090 reimbursement (Rd 108)(02S-114)	350			350	10,000			
Tulare	Tulare County		AB 3090 reimbursement (Rd 80)(02S-114)	400			400				
			SUBTOTAL:	41,098	0	0	2,945	38,153	0	0	
GARVEE Debt	Service, October	STIP Am	lendment Notices (December action)								
Los Angeles	Caltrans		GARVEE debt (Rt 1, Hughes Terr-Fiji Wy)(02S-105)	4,290		858	858	858	858	858	
Los Angeles	Caltrans		GARVEE debt (Rt 1, Hughes Terr-Sepulveda)(02S-105)	1,975		395	395	395	395	395	
Los Angeles	Caltrans		GARVEE debt (Rt 5 HOV, Rt 118-Rt 14)(02S-105)	6,700		1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	
Los Angeles	Caltrans		GARVEE debt (Rt 5, Western Av)(02S-105)	2,760		552	552	552	552	552	

## STIP CASH COMMITMENTS, AB 3090 AND GARVEE DEBT SERVICE

(\$1,000's)

County						Project Totals by Fiscal Year					
	Agency	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	
Los Angeles	Caltrans		GARVEE debt (Rt 10 HOV fiber optic relocation)(02S-105)	115		23	23	23	23	23	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	391A	GARVEE debt (Rt 14 HOV, Pearblossom Hwy)(02S-105)	20,725		4,145	4,145	4,145	4,145	4,145	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	2012A	GARVEE debt (Rt 90, Mindanao-Centinela)(02S-105)	8,735		1,747	1,747	1,747	1,747	1,747	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	2119	GARVEE debt (Rt 105, NB Sepulveda off ramp)(02S-105)	6,080		1,216	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,216	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	2223	GARVEE debt (Rt 134, Hollywood Way)(02S-105)(RIP)	950		190	190	190	190	190	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	2223	GARVEE debt (Rt 134, Hollywood Way)(02S-105)(IIP)	1,295		259	259	259	259	259	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	3329	GARVEE debt (Rt 138, Longview Rd-146th St)(02S-105)	3,690		738	738	738	738	738	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	422Y	GARVEE debt (Rt 210 landscaping)(02S-105)	1,105		221	221	221	221	221	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	2022Y	GARVEE debt (Rt 210 landscaping)(02S-105)	960		192	192	192	192	192	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	2333	GARVEE debt (Rt 405, Waterford-Rt 10)(02S-105)(RIP)	23,255		4,651	4,651	4,651	4,651	4,651	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	2333	GARVEE debt (Rt 405, Waterford-Rt 10)(02S-105)(IIP)	7,235		1,447	1,447	1,447	1,447	1,447	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	2336	GARVEE debt (Rt 405/101 gap closure)(02S-105)(RIP)	11,280		2,256	2,256	2,256	2,256	2,256	
Los Angeles	Caltrans	2336	GARVEE debt (Rt 405/101 gap closure)(02S-105)(IIP)	5,850		1,170	1,170	1,170	1,170	1,170	
Los Angeles	Glendale	9814	GARVEE debt (Glendale grade sep)(02S-105)(RIP)	2,315		463	463	463	463	463	
Los Angeles	Glendale	9814	GARVEE debt (Glendale grade sep)(02S-105)(IIP)	8,190		1,638	1,638	1,638	1,638	1,638	
Los Angeles	Los Angeles	2374	GARVEE debt (Centinela Av widening)(02S-105)	1,675		335	335	335	335	335	
Los Angeles	Vernon	4300	GARVEE debt (Atlantic/Bandini improvs)(02S-105)	1,580		316	316	316	316	316	
_											
			SUBTOTAL:	120,760		24,152	24,152	24,152	24,152	24,152	
			TOTAL, PROGRAMMED AND PENDING:	712,541	1,548	98,625	130,041	207,103	137,617	137,607	

## STIP CASH COMMITMENTS, AB 3090 AND GARVEE DEBT SERVICE

(\$1,000's)

#### **SUMMARY BY COUNTY - AB 3090 & GARVEE DEBT SERVICE**

County	Total	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09
Alameda	11,800	0	11,800	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	302,013	0	27,989	69,947	68,173	67,952	67,952
Placer	18,432	0	0	0	18,432	0	0
Riverside	160,032	0	17,630	20,029	61,683	30,350	30,340
Sacramento	1,891	0	1,891	0	0	0	0
San Diego	133,365	0	22,773	22,773	42,273	22,773	22,773
Santa Clara	84,258	1,548	16,542	16,542	16,542	16,542	16,542
Tulare	750	0	0	750	0	0	0
Total	712,541	1,548	98,625	130,041	207,103	137,617	137,607

#### **SUMMARY BY COUNTY - AB 3090 REIMBURSEMENTS ONLY**

County	Total	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09
Alameda	11,800	0	11,800	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	181,253	0	3,837	45,795	44,021	43,800	43,800
Placer	18,432	0	0	0	18,432	0	0
Riverside	31,324	0	0	0	31,324	0	0
Sacramento	1,891	0	1,891	0	0	0	0
San Diego	19,500	0	0	0	19,500	0	0
Santa Clara	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulare	750	0	0	750	0	0	0
Total	264,950	0	17,528	46,545	113,277	43,800	43,800

### **SUMMARY BY COUNTY - GARVEE DEBT SERVICE ONLY**

County	Total	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09
Alameda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	120,760	0	24,152	24,152	24,152	24,152	24,152
Placer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Riverside	128,708	0	17,630	20,029	30,359	30,350	30,340
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Diego	113,865	0	22,773	22,773	22,773	22,773	22,773
Santa Clara	84,258	1,548	16,542	16,542	16,542	16,542	16,542
Tulare	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
				·			
Total	447,591	1,548	81,097	83,496	93,826	93,817	93,807